UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/691,900	08/01/1996	JITENDRA APTE	2-4	2857

26652 7590 11/02/2005

AT&T CORP.
P.O. BOX 4110
MIDDLETOWN, NJ 07748

EXAMINER	
JEANTY, ROMAIN	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
3623	

DATE MAILED: 11/02/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/691,900	APTE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Romain Jeanty	3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *15 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,10-18,21-31,34-36,41,42,48-52 and 54-60* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7, 10-18, 21-31, 34-36, 41-42, 48-52, and 54-60* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Final Office Action is in response to the communication received August 15, 2005. Claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-31, 34-36, 41-42, 48-52, and 54-60 are pending in the application.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-31, 34-36, 41-42, 48-52, and 54-60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 recites that the said advertising software and said browser adapted to function independently of each other. It is unclear as to how the advertising software and the browser are adapted to function independently, and if the advertising software functions independently of the browser, then how it is possible that a link loads and displays a page in a second region by the browser? Appropriate action is required.

All other claims depending on independent claim 1 are also rejected under 35 USC 112 second rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-2, 5, 11, 22, 28, and 31 are rejected under35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent 5,959,623) in view of Dialog (Tool May Help Advertisers Target Individuals Dynamo Says It Can Generate Custom Pages Based On Interests).

As per claim1, Van Hoff et al discloses:

a. a server having advertisements, said server connected to said network (See figure 1 element 107).

b. a client computer comprising advertising software, a display device, a storage device, an input device and a browser, said client computer connected to the network (See figure 1, element 102 and col. 2 line 63 through col. 3 line 2), said advertisement software controlling the presentation of a first set of information to a the user in as first region of said display device (i.e. an advertising window application "software" for displaying information on a portion of the user's display) (col. 3, lines 13-17), said browser controlling the presentation of a second set of information to the user in a second region of said display device (i.e. the bytecode interpreter executing portion of the display method for displaying advertisements to the user) (col. 6, lines

36-44), said advertising software adapted to receive an advertisement from said server, said advertising software adapted to include said advertisement in said first set of information presented to the user in said first region of said display device (col. 7, lines 10-18), and said advertising software adapted to function substantially independent of said browser on said client computer (col. 6, lines 20+). It is noted that in Van Hoff, all the browser does is launch the ad window application. Once launched, bytecode interpreter 114 is invoked to take over the execution of the ad window application (col. 6, lines 20+) as a separate thread in a multi-tasking operating system. The functioning of the program does not start until executed, at that point the browser does not have anything with the ad window application, its interpreter 114 operating it as a separate thread. As a result it functions substantially independent of the browser in the browser area.

Van Hoff et al discloses all of the limitations above but fails to disclose ... analyzing the content of pages... Dialog in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of analyzing content of pages and selecting advertisements based on the content of the pages. Note page 1 of Dialog. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of VanHoff et al to include the teachings of Dialog with the motivation to target advertisements to particular users.

As per claims 2 and 28, Van Hoff et al further disclose wherein the a media clip related to the advertisement presently displayed by the advertising software to the user is shown on said client computer when said media clip is requested by a user (i.e. presenting video images of the advertisement to the user) (col. 4, lines 52-56).

As per claims 5 and 31, Van Hoff et al further disclose displaying other informational topics to the user (col. 4, lines 59-65).

As per claim 11, Van Hoff et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 11 in the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, Van Hoff et al discloses displaying a previously displayed advertisement at the user's request (col. 8, lines 32-35).

As per claim 22, Van Hoff et al discloses:

a. loading advertisement software from a server on a client computer with a browser at a user's request, said software dividing the client computer screen into browser area and an advertising area (col. 3, lines 38-43).

b. streaming a sequence of advertisements from said server to said client computer at the request of said client computer (col. 4, lines 45-51); and

c. displaying said advertisements to the user in said advertising are while maintaining functionality of the browser in the browser area client computer (col. 2, line 63 through col. 3 line 2, col. 3, lines 13-17; col. 6 lines 36-44 and col. 7 lines 10-18) (i.e. the bytecode interpreter executing portion of the display method for displaying advertisements to the user) (), and said advertising software adapted to function substantially independent of said browser on said client computer (col. 6, lines 20+). It is noted that in Van Hoff, all the browser does is launch the ad window application. Once launched, bytecode interpreter 114 is invoked to take over the execution of the ad window application (col. 6, lines 20+) as a separate thread in a multi-tasking operating system. The functioning of the program does not start until executed, at that point the browser does not have anything with the ad window application, its interpreter 114 operating it

as a separate thread. As a result, it maintains functionality of the browser in substantially independent of the browser in the browser area.

Furthermore, Van Hoff et al discloses all of the limitations above but fails to disclose ... analyzing the content of pages..... Dialog in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of analyzing content of pages and selecting advertisements based on the content of the pages. Note page 1 of Dialog. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of VanHoff et al to include the teachings of Dialog with the motivation to target advertisements to particular users.

7. Claims 3, 35-36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623) in view of Dialog (US Patent No. 5,835,007) and further in view of Payne et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314).

As per claim 3, Van Hoff et al and Dialog teach the limitations of claim 3 in the rejection of claim 1 above. However, Van Hoff et al and Dialog do not explicitly disclose wherein a secure purchase transaction is effectuated through said client computer at the user's request. Payne et al on the other hand, disclose a network sale that allows a user to make a purchase transaction at a merchant "advertiser" (col. 5, lines 26-56). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosures of Van Hoff et al and Dialog by including a secure purchase transaction in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Payne et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification because it would allow a user to purchase a desired advertised products from an advertiser.

As per claim 41, claim 41 recites the same limitations as that of rejected claim 22 above except for the following:

Accepting a confidential authentication password from the user and forwarding pre-registered purchaser information to the sponsor provided by the presently displayed advertisement if the confidential authentication password provided by the user matches a confidential authentication password stored on said server, and generating an error message if said password provided by the user does not match said password stored on said server. Payne et al discloses an advertising network sale system which accepts authentication information from a buyer and the buyer's purchase information (credit card information), and forwards the information to a merchant/sponsor/advertiser. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the advertising system of Hoff et al to include the buyer's authentication and purchase information a forward the information to a merchant in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Payne et al (col. 6 line15 through col. 8 line 2). A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination because it would allow the merchant to verify a buyer's information and sending to the buyer the desired purchased product.

As per claims 35 and 36, claims 35 and 36 recite all the limitations of rejected claim 22 above except for the following:

Accepting a secure purchase request from a user for the item offered in a presently displayed advertisement, and accepting purchase information from the user, wherein the secure purchase comprises the credit card information, said credit card information comprising the name of the credit card vendor, the user's name and credit card number, and the expiration data

of the user's credit card. Payne et al discloses the idea of accepting a secure purchase request from a buyer (col. 3, lines 24-34), accepting purchaser information from a buyer (col. 6, lines 22-26). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Van Hoff et al's disclosures to include accepting purchase information and credit card information in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Payne et al. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such modification in order to allow a buyer to purchase an advertised product and allowing a merchant to send a product to the buyer.

8. Claims 4, 7 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623), Dialog, and further in view of Taylor (Creating Cobol Web Pages with HTML).

As per claim 4, Van Hoff et al discloses the limitations of claim 4 in the rejection of claim 1 above. However, Van off et al and Dialog do not explicitly disclose a communications button for establishing communication between the user and a sales agent, said communications button displayed by the adverting software to the user, and wherein communications are established between the sales agent and the user at the user's request when the user selects the communications button. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a feedback button for communicating with a sponsor/sale agent (See Page 219). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the advertising system of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include the designed web page of Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification in order to allow a merchant to earn money for products being advertised.

As per claims 7 and 29, Van Hoff et al discloses the limitations of claim 4 in the

rejection of claims 1 and 22 above. However, Van off et al does not explicitly disclose an advertisement service homepage on said server, said home page displayed to a user at the request. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a home page. (See Page 218). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the advertising system of Van Hoff et al to include a home page in the same conventional manner as taught by Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification in order to create a shortcut for the user to go back to the first page.

9. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623) in view of Dialog, and further in view of Scroggie et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,469).

As per claim 6, Van Hoff et al discloses all of the limitations of 6 and 30 in the rejection of claim1 above. However, Van Hoff et al do and Dialog do not explicitly disclose a help page and said web page is displayed to the user by said the browser when the user selects a help button displayed to the user by advertising software. Scroggie et al disclose the idea of presenting a help and home page to a user when a user browses a system (See figure 4 element 122 and col. 7, lines 15-21). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosures of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include a help page in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Scroggie. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to obtain registration information about the user.

10. Claims 10, 34 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623), in view of Dialog (Tool May Help Advertisers Target Individuals Dynamo Says It Can Generate Custom Pages Based On Interests), and further in view of Barnett et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,099).

As per claims 10, 34 and 42, Van Hoff et al and Dialog disclose all of the limitations of claim 10 in the rejection of claims 1, 22 and 41 above. However, Van Hoff et al and Dialog do not explicitly disclose an electronic coupon that may be selected by the user, wherein said electronic coupon is stored on said client computer. Barnett et al on the other hand, discloses the idea of a user selecting an electronic coupon and storing the electronic coupon on the user's computer (col. 7, lines 12-21 and col. 8, lines 23-33). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include an electronic coupon selected buy a user and storing the electronic coupon on the user's computer. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to so in order to provide incentives to the user to purchase an advertised product.

11. Claims 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623), Dialog (Tool May Help Advertisers Target Individuals Dynamo Says It Can Generate Custom Pages Based On Interests) in view of Payne et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314), and further in view of Bixler et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,483,895)

As per claim 13, claim 13 recites the same limitations of rejected claim1 except for a transaction area having a secure purchase button for effectuating a secure purchase transaction at the user's request. Payne et al on the other hand, discloses a network sale that allows a user to make a purchase transaction at a merchant "advertiser" (col. 5, lines 26-56). It would have been

obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Van Hoff et al by including a secure purchase transaction in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Payne et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification because it would allow a user to purchase desired advertised products from an advertiser.

Further, the combination of Van Hoff et al and Payne et al does not explicitly disclose "a control area having a pause button, a step back button, and a step forward button by which the presentation of advertisements to the user is controlled by the user". However, Bixler et al discloses the idea of skipping, back-warding and pausing the display of advertisements (col. 2, lines 19-23). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of VanHoff et al by including back-warding and pausing a displayed advertisement in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bixler et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to allow a user to manipulate playback of advertisements.

Furthermore, the combination of Van Hoff et al and Dialog discloses all of the limitations above but fails to disclose ... selected based on an analysis of at least one page.... Furthermore, Van Hoff et al discloses all of the limitations above but fails to disclose ...selecting advertisements based on an analysis of the content of pages...Dialog in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of measuring the interest of a user by measuring the time a user spends reading a page and displaying advertisements to the user therefrom, which reads on "analyzing the content of the pages displayed in the browser display area and choosing advertisements relating to the content of such pages" (col. 58 line 58 through col. 10 and col. 60,

lines 11-41). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of VanHoff et al to include the teachings of Dialog. A person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification in order to target advertisements to particular users.

As per claim 18, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 18 in the rejection of claim 13 above. In addition, Van Hoff discloses displaying other informational topics to the user (col. 4, lines 59-65).

10. Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623), Dialog (Tool May Help Advertisers Target Individuals Dynamo Says It Can Generate Custom Pages Based On Interests), and further in view of Payne et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314).

As per claim 26, the limitations of claim 26 have been recited in the rejection of claim 22 above, except for a transaction area having a secure purchase button for effectuating a secure purchase transaction at the user's request. Payne et al on the other hand, discloses a network sale that allows a user to make a purchase transaction at a merchant "advertiser" (col. 5, lines 26-56). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosures of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include the teachings of Payne et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification because it would allow a user to purchase desired advertised products from a merchant/or advertiser.

12. Claim14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al in view of Dialog and further in view of Taylor "Creating Cobol Web Pages with HTML".

As per claim 14, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 14 in the rejection of claim13 above. However, neither Van Hoff et al, Dialog teaches a communications button for establishing communication with a sales agent at the user's request. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a feedback button for communicating with a sponsor/sale agent. Note entire reference of Taylor. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Van Hoff et al and Hertz to include the teachings of Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such modification in order to allow a merchant to earn money for products being advertised.

13. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,959,623), in view of Dialog, in view of Payne et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314), and further in view of Scroggie et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,469).

As per claim15, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Payne et al discloses all of the limitations in the rejection of claim 13 above. However, Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Payne et al do not explicitly disclose a help page and said web page being displayed to the user by said the browser when the user selects a help button displayed to the user by advertising software. However, Scroggie et al disclose the idea of presenting a help and home page to a user when a user browses a system (See figure 4 element 122 and col. 7, lines 15-21). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosures of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include a help page in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Scroggie. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to obtain registration information about the user.

14. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al in view of Dialog, Payne et al, Bixler et al, and further in view of Redford (U.S. Patent No. 5957695).

As per claim 16, Neither Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler et al discloses the idea of a multimedia button. Redford in the same field of endeavor discloses the idea of using a multimedia button (col. 16, lines 14-62). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the disclosure of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, and Payne et al to include multimedia information in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Redford. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use a modification to allow users to remotely control use of associated electronic content.

15. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al in view of Bixler and further in view of Taylor "Creating Cobol Web Pages with HTML"

As per claim 17, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler et al discloses all of the limitations of claim 17 in the rejection of claim 13 above. Neither Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler discloses an advertisement service homepage on said server, said home page displayed to a user at the user's request. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a home page (See Page 218). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the advertising system of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler to include a home page as taught by Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification in order to create a shortcut for the user to go back to the first page.

16. Claim 21 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al, Dialog, in view of Payne et al, Bixler as applied to claim 13 above and further in view of Barnett et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,099).

As per claim 21, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler discloses all of the limitations of claim 21 in the rejection of claim 13 above. However, neither Van Hoff et al, Payne et al or Bixler discloses an electronic coupon that may be selected by the user, wherein said electronic coupon is stored on said client computer, and said electronic coupon redeemable during a secure purchase transaction. Barnett et al on the other hand, discloses the idea of a user selecting an electronic coupon and storing the electronic coupon on the user's computer (col. 7, lines 12-21 and col. 8, lines 23-33). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Payne et al to include an electronic coupon selected buy a user and storing the electronic coupon on the user's computer. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do so because it would provide Van Hoff et al and Dialog and Payne et al with the enhanced capability to provide incentives to the user to purchase an advertised product. Most coupons are usually redeemed during a purchase transaction.

17. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al, in view of Bixler et al as applied to claim 22 above and further in view of Taylor "Creating Cobol Web Pages with HTML".

As per claim 27, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler et al fails to teach a communications button for establishing communication with a sales agent at the user's request. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a feedback button

for communicating with a sponsor/sale agent. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the system of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, Payne et al and Bixler et al to include the teachings of Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such modification in order to allow a merchant to earn money for products being advertised.

18. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623) in view of Dialog, and further in view of Scroggie et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,970,469).

As per claim 30, Van Hoff et al and Dialog do not explicitly disclose a help page and said web page is displayed to the user by said the browser when the user selects a help button displayed to the user by advertising software. Scroggie et al discloses the idea of presenting a help and home page to a user when a user browses a system (See figure 4 element 122 and col. 7, lines 15-21). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the disclosures of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include a help page in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Scroggie. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to obtain registration information about the user.

19. Claim 12, 23-25, 48-49, 51-52, 54-55 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al (U.S. Patent No 5,959,623) in view of Dialog and further in view of Bixler et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,483,895).

As per claims 12 and 23, Van Hoff et al and Dialog fail to explicitly disclose teaches the idea of pausing the display of advertisements. Bixler et al in the same field of endeavor, discloses

the idea of pausing advertisements (col. 2, lines 19-23). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Van Hoff et al and Dialog by including pausing the displayed advertisement in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bixler et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to allow a user to have more time to review the contents of the advertisements.

As per claims 24-25, Van Hoff et al and Dialog fail to explicitly disclose caching a predetermined number of advertisements. Official Notice is taken that it is notoriously old and well known to catching a predetermined number of advertisement is old and well known in the art. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the disclosure of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include the well-known feature of caching a predetermined amount of advertisement for the motivation having of local access to the advertisements. In support of the Official Notice, Applicant is referred to col. 2, lines 21-32 and col. 6, lines 41-53 of Shaw et al U.S. Patent No. 6,199,106. Furthermore, Van Hoff et al and Dialog fail to explicitly disclose teaches the idea of pausing the display of advertisements. Bixler et al in the same field of endeavor, disclose the idea of pausing advertisements (col. 2, lines 19-23). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Van Hoff et al by including pausing the displayed advertisement in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bixler et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to allow a user to have more time to review the contents of the advertisements.

As per claims 48-49, 54, Van Hoff et al discloses:

a. microprocessor (See figure 1, element 105);

b. memory that stores browser software adapted to be executed to retrieve and display a hypertext page from a site (col. 3, lines 33-37), and advertising software adapted to retrieve and display advertisement from an advertising server (i.e. an Ad window program for displaying advertisements to the user, a display device on which to display the hypertext page and the advertisement to the user (col. 3, lines 11-20 and col. 4, lines 10-36). However, Hoff et al does not explicitly discloses a step forward button and a step back button to the user, such that the step forward button is selected by the user, a next advertisement in a sequence of advertisements from the advertising server is displayed to the user independently from the page that is displayed to the user browser and when the step back button is selected by the user, a previous advertisement in the sequence of advertisement from the advertising server is displayed to the user independently from the page that is displayed to the user by the browser, and display the hypertext page and the advertisement to the user. Bixler on the other hand, discloses a user manipulating a list of advertisement by forwarding, back-warding within the ad. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the advertising system of Van Hoff et al to include back-warding an forwarding within the advertisement in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bixler et al. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such modification in order allow a user to allow a user to easily access advertisement of interest. It is further noted in Hoff et al that in Van Hoff, all the browser does is launch the ad window application. Once launched, bytecode interpreter 114 is invoked to take over the execution of the ad window application (col. 6, lines 20+) as a separate thread in a multi-tasking operating system. The functioning of the program

does not start until executed, at that point the browser does not have anything with the ad window application, its interpreter 114 operating it as a separate thread. As a result it functions substantially independent of the browser in the browser area.

Further, the combination of Van Hoff et al and Bixler does not expressly disclose .. analyzing the content of the pages displayed in the browser display area and choosing advertisements relating to the content of such pages. Dialog in the same field of endeavor, discloses the concept of analyzing content of pages and selecting advertisements based on the content of the pages. Note page 1 of Dialog. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the disclosures of VanHoff et al and Bixler et al to include the teachings of Dialog with the motivation to target advertisements to particular users.

As per claim 51, Hoff et al further discloses wherein said advertisement software is adapted to be executed by said CPU to display a list of topics to the user, such that when the user selects a topic from the list of topics, advertisements pertaining to that topic are received from the advertising server (col. 3, lines 13-22).

As per claim 52, Van Hoff and Dialog fail to specifically disclose wherein a previously displayed advertisement is displayed to a user at the user's request. Bixler et al in the same of endeavor, discloses the idea of pausing the display of advertisements (col. 2, lines 19-23). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Van Hoff et al and Dialog to include pausing a displayed advertisement in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Bixler et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such combination in order to allow a user to have more time to review the contents of the advertisements.

As per claim 55, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Bixler et al discloses the limitations of claims 55 in the rejection of claim 48 above. In addition, Van Hoff further discloses wherein the a media clip related to the advertisement presently displayed by the advertising software to the user is shown on said client computer when said media clip is requested by a user (i.e. presenting video images of the advertisement to the user) (col. 4, lines 52-56).

As per claims 57 and 58, Hoff et al discloses wherein the graphical interface through which the user purchases a product is displayed to the user by the software and the browser (See figure 100 element 107 and col. 4, lines 52-56).

20. Claims 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al and Dialog, Bixler et al and further in view Payne et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,715,314).

As per claim 56, the combination of Van Hoff, Dialog and Bixler et al discloses the limitations of claim 56 in the rejection of claim 48 above. Neither Van Hoff et al or Bixler discloses wherein a secure purchase transaction is effectuated through said client computer at the user's request. Payne et al on the other hand, discloses a network sale that allows a user to make a purchase transaction at a merchant "advertiser" (col. 5, lines 26-56). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Bixler et al to include a secure purchase transaction in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Payne et al. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such modification because it would allow a user to purchase a desired advertised products from an advertiser.

21. Claim 50 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al, Dialog in view of Bixler et al as applied to claim 48 above and further in view of Taylor "Creating Cobol Web Pages with HTML".

As per claim 50, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Bixler et al does not explicitly disclose a communications button for establishing communication between the user and a sales agent, said communications button displayed by the adverting software to the user, and wherein communications are established between the sales agent and the user at the user's request when the user selects the communications button. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a feedback button for communicating with a sponsor/sale agent (See Page 219). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the advertising system of Van Hoff et al, Dialog, and Bixler et al to include the web page comprising a button to contact a sales agent/sponsor in the same conventional manner as disclosed by Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such modification in order to allow a merchant to earn money for products being advertised.

22. Claim 59 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al, Dialog in view of Bixler et al as applied to claim 48 above and further in view of Barnett et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,099).

As per claim 59, the combination of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Bixler et al does not explicitly disclose an electronic coupon that may be selected by the user, wherein said electronic coupon is stored on said client computer. Barnett et al on the other hand, discloses the idea of a user selecting an electronic coupon and storing the electronic coupon on the user's computer

(col. 7, lines 12-21 and col. 8, lines 23-33). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Bixler et al to include an electronic coupon selected by a user and storing the electronic coupon on the user's computer. One having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to so because it would provide incentives to the user to purchase an advertised product.

23. Claim 60 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Hoff et al, Dialog in view of Bixler et al and further in view of Taylor "Creating Cobol Web Pages with HTML".

As per claim 60, Van Hoff et al, Dialog discloses the limitations of claim 60 in the rejection of claim 48 above. Neither Van off et al or Bixler et al explicitly a displayed home page button and selecting the home page button to display a page by the browser software, wherein the page includes information pertaining to the sponsor of the advertisement that was displayed to the user at the time the user selected the home page button. Taylor on the other hand, discloses a web page comprising of a home page and the user having the capability to select a sponsor on the page. (See Page 218). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to modify the advertising system of Van Hoff et al, Dialog and Bixler et al to include a home page and select a page from the home page in the same conventional manner as taught by Taylor. A person having ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to use such a modification in order to create a shortcut for the user to go back to the first page.

Remarks

24. Applicant asserted that the combination of Hoff et al and Dialog do not teach the claimed invention. In particular, Applicant supported his assertion by arguing the claims that the combination of Hoff et al does not teach that the advertisements a re targeted by analyzing **content** (the claim was amended to by adding the word *content*) of the pages. In response, The examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant argument because the newly cited reference Dialog) does teach the concept of analyzing pages a user visits and select advertisements based on the content of the analyzed pages. Note new rejection above. Therefore applicant's argument is moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Conclusion

25. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Herz (US patent No. 5,835,087) discloses the concept of analyzing a page based on a user's interest and displaying advertisement to the user based on the page analysis.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Romain Jeanty whose telephone number is (571) 272-6732. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thurs 7:30AM - 6:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq R. Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Romain Jeanty
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3623
October 31, 2005